

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks contained herein in response to the Office Action mailed October 9, 2007. Applicant respectfully submits that the remarks contained herein place the instant application in condition for allowance. Upon entry of this response, claims 1 – 18 and 24 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Examiner Interview

Applicant first wishes to express sincere appreciation for the time that Examiner Stork spent with Applicant's Attorney, Anthony Bonner, during a telephone discussion on January 8, 2008 regarding the outstanding Office Action. During that conversation, Examiner Stork and Mr. Bonner discussed *Goodman*, as provided to Applicant. More specifically, the copy of *Goodman* that was provided to Applicant is missing a significant portion of text on the right margin. Additionally, Examiner Stork asserted that the publication date relied upon in the Office Action is verified on a page that was not provided to Applicant. As such, Examiner Stork suggested that Applicant submits a response indicating these deficiencies to which a nonfinal Office Action would be issued. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner Stork carefully consider this response.

II. Claims 1 – 17 and 24 are Allowable Over *Brown* further in view of *Barlow* and further in view of *Goodman*

The Office Action indicates that claims 1 – 17 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,278,448 ("*Brown*") further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,275,935 ("*Barlow*") and further in view of U.S. Non Patent Literature "Dynamic HTML: The Definitive Reference, 1998, Chapter 4" ("*Goodman*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the reason that *Brown* further in view of *Barlow*

and further in view of *Goodman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 1. Additionally, as discussed above, *Goodman*, as provided to Applicant, is missing significant portions of text on the right margin. As such, Applicant submits that *Goodman* is deficient for this rejection. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the only publication date provided in *Goodman* is 2007, which Applicant submits is later than the filing date of the present application. Thus, *Goodman* does not qualify as prior art, and the rejection based on *Goodman* in combination with *Brown* and *Barlow* is improper. For at least these reasons, claims 1 – 17 and 24 are allowable over the cited art of record.

III. Claim 18 is Allowable Over *Moneymaker* and further in view of *Goodman*

The Office Action indicates that claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2002/0049708 (“*Moneymaker*”) and further in view of U.S. Non Patent Literature “Dynamic HTML: The Definitive Reference, 1998, Chapter 4” (“*Goodman*”). Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reason that *Moneymaker* and further in view of *Goodman* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the elements of claim 18. Additionally, as discussed above, *Goodman*, as provided to Applicant, is missing significant portions of text on the right margin. As such, Applicant submits that *Goodman* is deficient for this rejection. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the only publication date provided in *Goodman* is 2007, which Applicant submits is later than the filing date of the present application. Thus, *Goodman* does not qualify as prior art, and the rejection based on *Goodman* in combination with *Brown* and *Barlow* is improper. For at least these reasons, claims 1 – 17 and 24 are allowable over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submit that all rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/afb/

Anthony F. Bonner Jr. Reg. No. 55,012

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1500
600 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500
Customer No.: **38823**